DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 261 HE 031 317

AUTHOR Guerrero, Janis K.
TITLE Latino Faculty at Research Institutions in the Southwestern United States.
PUB DATE 1998-04-14
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *College Faculty; Ethnic Groups; *Faculty Publishing; *Faculty Workload; Higher Education; *Hispanic Americans; *Latin Americans; Minority Groups; *Noninstructional Responsibility; Productivity; Professors; Questionnaires; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Latinos

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the professional roles and research productivity of Latino academics at four research institutions in the southwestern U.S. Research focused on the academics' general productivity, professional roles, and motivations, as well as ethnicity-specific issues. Questionnaires sent to Latino faculty at the assistant, associate, and full professor level in a broad range of departments and academic programs yielded 123 usable surveys (response rate of 62 percent). Major findings included the following: (1) the largest group (40.8 percent) of Latinos were assistant professors, with the remaining evenly distributed between full and associate professorships; (2) the majority of respondents worked in liberal arts, education, and the professional graduate schools; (3) 35 percent of faculty devote 25 to 49 percent of their time each week to research; 41.6 percent devote a similar percentage to teaching; (4) the majority (64.1 percent) of Latino faculty devote 1 to 24 percent of their time to service; they are most likely to be active on their own campus rather than in their discipline at-large; and (5) 50.4 percent of faculty publish one to ten articles in refereed journals during their career, with 45.3 percent publishing or editing one to four books and monographs. (Contains 45 references.) (MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 261

Latino Faculty at Research Institutions in the Southwestern United States

Janis K. Guerrero

Charles A. Dana Center, The University of Texas at Austin

Running Head: Latino Faculty at Research Institutions

HE 031 317

Janis K. Guerrero

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

1

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to describe Latino academics at research institutions in the southwestern United States through an exploration of their professional roles and research productivity. Research questions that guided the study focused on the faculty subgroup's demographics, work roles and preferences, professional background and practices, and research support and productivity. The data necessary to answer the research questions were gathered through a survey that consisted of two dimensions. One dimension of the survey borrowed heavily from Lawrence and Blackburn's (1991) *Faculty at Work* survey and focused on indicators of productivity, professional role participation and preference, and motivation for role preference. A second dimension of the survey was designed by the researcher and centered on ethnic-specific indicators of productivity, professional role participation and preference, and motivation. The population examined in the study consisted of Latino faculty at four research institutions in the southwestern United States. Based on the findings of this study, the Latino faculty at four research institutions in the southwestern United States were a diverse, well-educated, and productive group. Most, or 88.5 percent, of them self-identified as Chicano, Latino, or Hispanic, with the remainder identifying as Cuban, Puerto Rican, South American, and Native American. The largest group, or 40.8 percent of Latinos were assistant professors, with the remaining faculty evenly distributed between full and associate professorships. Latinos were distributed throughout the academic areas, but the majority of them were in liberal arts, education, and the professional graduate schools. Slightly more than a third of the Latino faculty were of foreign birth. Most Latino faculty indicated that their primary professional interest lies in both teaching and research, but their interest leans toward research. Findings from this study indicate that 35 percent of Latino faculty in research universities devote 25 to 49 percent of their time each week to research; and 41.6 percent devote similar percentages of time to teaching each week. The majority or 64.1 percent of Latino faculty devote 1 to 24 percent of their weekly time to service. Within the service domain, Latino faculty are more

likely to be active within their own departments or campus than within the larger field of their discipline. The largest group or 50.4 percent of the Latino faculty reported that they had published 1 to 10 articles in refereed journals over their entire career. Also, 45.3 percent of the faculty reported that they have published or edited alone or in collaboration 1 to 4 books and monographs over their career. Findings from this study are consistent with the previous literature on Latino scholarship, as most of the respondents expressed interest in researching ethnic issues, and most of them actually conducted research on those issues.

Latino Faculty at Research Institutions in the Southwestern United States

Background

Latino faculty in research institutions perform services that are vital to the missions of their organizations. Their presence at research institutions stimulates the nation's receptivity to the benefits of the diverse nature of its society in important ways: by providing Latino and non-Latino youth with role models; by preparing Latino youth to assume leadership positions; and by supporting Latino-related scholarship (Washington and Harvey, 1989). Numerous reports on the status of higher education for Latino youth have cited the importance of Latino faculty as part of a strategy to increase the participation and matriculation of Latino students in higher education institutions (Gandara, 1979; Gandara, 1986; National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, 1984). Equally important is the contribution that Latino faculty make to minority-oriented service activities which promote the research institution's organizational stability and continuity (Aguirre, 1987).

Purpose of the Study

Because Latino faculty in research institutions provide vital services, yet have such a limited presence in the universities, numerous studies have recommended investigating this faculty subgroup more carefully. The purpose of this study was to describe Latino academics at research institutions in the southwestern United States through an exploration of their professional roles and research productivity. Specifically, the study sought to characterize Latino faculty through data gathered from a survey. Research questions that guided the study focused on the faculty subgroup's demographics, work roles and preferences, professional background and practices, and research support and productivity.

The Latino Academic's Experience in Higher Education

Although studies on Latino faculty are limited in number, the experience of the Latino scholar in the higher education environment has been fairly well documented. Generally,

the literature provides a consistent portrayal of the Latino scholar's difficult work environment, of his struggle to reconcile competing demands from community and academe, and of his inclination to research and teach ethnic topics (Padilla and Chavez, 1995). Much of the literature focuses on the barriers that Latino faculty face in professional advancement, and the obstacles most often cited are research productivity and institutional demands for service in minority-related matters.

Reyes and Halcon (1988) portrayed the Latino scholar in an academe unchanged in its decades-old exclusionary practices. They contend that the progress of the Latino faculty member is impeded by forms of tokenism, typecasting, limitations on minority hiring, devaluing of Latino research, and hairsplitting practices that prevent Latinos from being hired or promoted.

Escobedo (1980) described barriers to professional advancement faced by Latino faculty that she believed were a result of their sparse representation on campus. Latino scholars, she said are overloaded by demands for their services from the Latino and the academic communities. Escobedo suggested that the Latino faculty member is caught in a dilemma because the service burdens demanded by the institution are critical to the success of Latino students but are damaging to the Latino's career because the time needed for research is diverted to activities less valued by their departments.

Agreeing that Latinos were constrained by institutional demands for their service on minority-issues committees, Garza (1988) reported that a survey of 149 Latino faculty showed 43 percent participated in affirmative action or ethnic community-related committees. Similarly, in a study that examined the institutional participation of Mexican Americans in academe, Aguirre (1987) found that his 159 Mexican American respondents reported more frequent participation on minority related committees than on university-related committees. Aguirre suggested that the participation of Mexican American faculty in minority-related activities was not an organizational option they chose, but was the result of

a lack of options because of the absence of a sponsoring network for more influential and prestigious appointments.

Escobedo (1980) speculated that service responsibilities isolated the Latino and restricted an "informal exchange of ideas, knowledge of available jobs and funding sources, and development of professional contacts in funding agencies" (p. 10). She said that the isolation of the Latino scholar was manifested in Latino underrepresentation in professional organizations and traditional journals. Escobedo (1980) and Arce (1976) agreed that Latino research was undervalued and the lack of publishing outlets receptive to Latino research was a significant problem that compounded the isolation of Latino scholars and contributed to their invisibility.

The Latino Academic's Interest in Ethnic Research and Teaching

A small corpus of knowledge on the professional roles of Latino faculty indicates that the majority of the faculty includes ethnic issues in their research and teaching. Garza's (1992) National Latino Faculty Survey revealed that two-thirds of his 238 respondents had written doctoral dissertations that dealt with their own ethnic group. The research interests of Garza's sample persisted into their academic careers; he reported that 85 percent of his respondents were currently involved in research concerning Latinos. Wolf and Ingle's (1993) study of Latina faculty reported similar findings: 32 percent of their 199 all-female respondents indicated that they had written dissertations dealing with topics related to their ethnicity; 57 percent said that they conducted ethnically-related research most or all the time; and 63 percent believed that Latino academics should be involved in some research relevant to their ethnic group.

There are different explanations for the Latino scholar's predilection to research and teach ethnic topics. Garza (1992) suggests that the socio-political context of the 1960s, when the majority of the Latino professoriate matured, molded the young scholars into "assuming nationalistic postures in defense of their communities in both their social actions and in their written works" (p. 10). Conflicting expectations from the Latino community,

which demanded that their intellectual leaders be advocates, and the academic community, which demanded detached scholarship, moved the Latino scholar "to seek answers and skills that directly translated into meaningful resolution to the social injustice and inequality facing their communities" (p.10). It is this dynamic, according to Garza, that has persuaded the Latino academic to adopt ethnic topics as areas of substantive research.

Reyes and Halcon's (1988) interpretation of the Latino scholar's preference for ethnic research is consistent with Garza's; however, they expand on Garza's concept of advocacy for the community. They propose that Latino scholars' research interests have a genesis in their recognition of a shared history of discrimination, and an undeniable need to authenticate prevailing deficit theories about the Latino community, and a genuine desire to assist the community in improving its circumstances. Reyes and Halcon assert that Latino scholars give their community opportunity to "speak for ourselves, to define, label, describe, and interpret our own condition from the inside out" (p. 306).

Johnsrud and Sadao's (1993) study of ethnic and racial minority faculty concluded that their respondents expressed a strong sense of responsibility to serve their ethnic community even though the commitment to their community was frequently in conflict with their career goals. Two other studies substantially demonstrate the extension of the Latino's interest in ethnic research and teaching. Garza (1992) reported 75 percent of his respondents and Wolf and Ingle (1993) reported 54 percent of their respondents included ethnic material in their classroom instruction.

Conceptual Framework

This study relied on numerous studies of productivity in order to isolate variables for the survey instrument. Specifically, Lawrence and Blackburn's (1991) *Faculty at Work* survey study, Creswell's (1985) meta-analysis of studies on research performance, and Fox's (1985) comprehensive review of literature on publication and performance informed the selection of variables to measure productivity. A broad review of the literature on professional roles, in particular, Ladd and Lipset (1977), Yuker (1984), and Fulton and

Trow (1974) informed the investigation of the three major areas of faculty work. Similarly, a review of research on ethnic populations and faculty, in particular, Elmore and Blackburn (1983), Escobedo (1980), and Valverde (1981), Garza (1992), and Wolf and Ingle (1993) informed the development of ethnic-specific indicators of faculty roles and professional behaviors for the survey.

Finally, Patterson's (1975) model was used to describe connections between the experiences of ethnic group members and their choices of professional behavior. Patterson's (1975) three principles of ethnic allegiance, proposes that individuals seek to reconcile conflicting interests in ways that satisfy their group allegiance while maximizing gains and minimizing risks. Patterson's model suggests that Latino faculty in research institutions will tend to align themselves with ethnic groups and issues, but they will also practice professional behaviors associated with reward and survival in academia.

Method

The Questionnaire

The data necessary to answer the research questions were gathered through a survey that consisted of two dimensions. One dimension of the survey borrowed heavily from Lawrence and Blackburn's (1991) *Faculty at Work* survey and focused on indicators of productivity, professional role participation and preference, and motivation for role preference.

Survey items measuring research productivity included open-ended queries about the number of articles published in refereed journals, over the respondent's career; and the number of books and monographs published or edited alone or in collaboration, over the respondent's career. Another set of items, recorded by set ranges, measured frequency of publication during the prior two years of (1) publications in non-refereed or non-academic outlets; (2) articles submitted to academic or professional journals; (3) edited books; and (4) authored or co-authored books. A final set of items—some open-ended and some recorded by set ranges—inquired about the respondent's involvement in activities supportive of

his/her research. These items included queries about (1) submission of grant proposals and success in acquiring funding; (2) applications for fellowships and acceptance rate; (3) sources for research funding; and (4) preferences for peer review of manuscripts prior to submission for publication.

Teaching was measured through two sets of items. One set of items, recorded by Likert scales, measured frequency of mentoring relationships initiated by students; frequency of need to schedule additional office hours in order to advise or mentor students; and degree of preference for research or teaching. A final open-ended item sought the number of hours per week that the respondent allotted for office hours.

Service was measured through items that called for responses to be in set ranges that measured the frequency of participation during the prior two years in the following activities: organized a professional meeting; served on an editorial board of a journal; participated in campus-wide committees dealing with major issues; chaired a campus or departmental committee; played a role in the department's curriculum revision; and participated in a study to solve a problem in the department, college, or university.

A second dimension of the survey was designed by the researcher and centered on ethnic-specific indicators of productivity, professional role participation and preference, and motivation. Relevant to research, a number of items—some open-ended, some recorded by Likert scales measuring degree, and some recorded by set ranges measuring frequency—asked the respondent to indicate (1) funding sources for research related to ethnic issues; (2) perception of pressure to research and/or teach ethnic issues; (3) interest and degree of involvement in research on ethnic issues; (3) changes in the respondent's focus on ethnic issues in his/her research; and (4) preferences for choice of ethnicity of peer reviewers of manuscripts prior to submission for publication.

To measure involvement in the service dimension, open-ended items directed the respondent to report on (1) the number of active memberships in community organizations *that are concerned with minority-related issues*; (2)) the number of active memberships in

community organizations *whose main focus is not minority related*; (3) the number of active memberships in professional organizations *that are predominantly ethnic or racial minority in membership*; and (4)) the number of active memberships in professional organizations *that are not predominantly ethnic or racial minority in membership.* A final section of the survey sought demographic information.

Validity and Reliability

Content validity of the survey instrument was established through a 3-stage pilot study, as recommended by McMillan and Schumacher (1984). The internal consistency reliability of the instrument was established through a Chronbach's alpha correlation of three scales representing research, teaching, and service.

Techniques suggested by Dillman (1978) were used to maximize responses to the mailed survey. External population validity was addressed through an abbreviated, follow-up telephone survey of a stratified, random sample of non-respondents. This follow-up survey was conducted to determine if faculty who responded to the mailed survey were different from those who did not. Non-respondents who participated in the follow-up survey did not differ significantly from the respondents in their answers.

The Population and Sample

The population examined in the study consisted of Latino faculty at four research institutions in the southwestern United States. Assistant, associate, and full professors from a broad range of departments and academic programs were invited to respond to the survey. All departments and academic programs were included in the study in order to increase the number of eligible Latino faculty. A response rate of 62 percent of the mailed surveys resulted in 123 usable surveys.

Quality control measures to assure proper coding and data entry included use of the EXCEL spreadsheet software program. This program generated the appropriate SAS file that was used to run frequencies and Cronbach's alpha.

Results

Demographics

Of the 123 usable surveys from Latino faculty, 88.5 percent self-identified as Chicano, Latino, or Hispanic. The remaining 11.2 percent self-identified as Cuban, Puerto Rican, South American and Native American. Faculty who self-identified as Native American were removed from subsequent data analysis.

Of the 120 remaining Latino respondents, 73.3 percent were male; 26.6 percent were female. Though lop-sided, the gender representation is consistent with the U.S. Department of Education estimates of 79.3 percent males and 20.7 percent females in faculties at public research institutions (1988). Most respondents were young; 64 percent of the males and 73 percent of the females were between 29 and 48 years of age. And although 93.3 percent of the respondents reported tenured or tenure-track positions, the largest group held assistant professorships at 40.8 percent, with equal groups of 26.6 percent each reporting full and associate professorships.

The respondents' youth was evident in their recent appointments and the length of their tenure; 50.8 percent have been at their current institutions for 5 or fewer years and 58.3 percent have held their present professional rank between 1 and 4 years. Also, the majority of the respondents had received a terminal degree from a prestigious doctoral school relatively recently—80.8 percent held a Ph.D.; 63.1 percent had earned their highest degree within the last 14 years; and 64.6 percent received their doctorate from a prestigious school. Most of the Latino faculty are in the liberal arts, although an appreciable number are associated with colleges of education and graduate schools; 54.3 percent reported appointments in liberal arts; 12.9 percent reported education appointments, and 12.9 percent reported graduate school appointments.

A surprisingly large number of the Latino faculty are non-natives; 35 percent of the respondents reported birth in a country other than the United States. Of the respondents who reported foreign birth, 45 percent indicated that they were 21 years of age or older at

the time that they established permanent residence in the United States, and 40 percent reported completion of 13 or more years of school prior to the establishment of permanent U.S. residence.

Time Allocation to Professional Roles

Numerous studies (DeVries, 1975; Mukherjee, 1968; Chaney, 1966; Friedlander and Marguiles, 1969) have explored the correlation between the personal values of higher education faculty and their allotment of time to professional roles. Because faculty allocate time and effort to their professional roles according to the values they ascribe to roles, it was interesting to find that a majority or 51.7 percent of the respondents indicated their primary interests were in both teaching and research, but leaned toward research. The respondents' interest in research was reflected in they way they allotted their time; the largest group or 35 percent reported spending between 25 and 49 percent of their time in research; another 25.8 percent of the respondents indicated that they spent 50 to 74 percent of their time in research. The large proportion of respondents who reported spending between 25 and 74 percent of their time in research was consistent with Bowen and Schuster's (1986) estimate that university faculty devote an average of 33 percent of their time per week on research.

Research Productivity

An examination of the Latino respondents' productivity, over the course of their careers, showed that they are active producers of research. Fifty percent of the respondents reported publication of 1 to 10 articles in refereed journals over their entire careers; and 52.8 percent reported they had published or edited 1 to 6 books and monographs over their careers.

Similarly, a more focused and current snapshot of the Latinos' productivity—their work within the last two years—showed consistent research activity. Thirty-four percent of the respondents reported they had authored or co-authored 1 to 5 books; 30.6 percent had edited 1 to 5 books; 48.6 percent had written 1 to 11 research reports for an agency,

institution, or other group; and 58.6 had published 1 to 11 articles in non-refereed or non-academic outlets. Also, it is noteworthy that most of the respondents reported considerable prepublishing activity during the last two years; 86.3 percent had submitted 1 to 11 articles for publication in an academic or professional journal.

Findings from a comparative study (Guerrero, 1995) of matched pairs of Latino and European American faculty at research universities in the southwestern United States help to bring some perspective to this study's survey results. Guerrero used matched pair t-tests to test the null hypothesis that the mean scores of the Latino and the European American faculty were not significantly different in the areas of teaching, research, and service, Guerrero's study (1995) found that the two faculty groups demonstrated similar rates of production of articles in refereed journals over their careers, with mean scores for Latinos being 13.1 articles; and for European Americans, 16.0. Also, the two groups showed similarity in their publishing rates for books and monographs over their careers, with Latinos showing a mean of 2.5 books and monographs, and European Americans, a mean of 2.8. Finally, the two groups evidenced similarity in their publication rates on four variables within the prior two years—publication in non-refereed or non-academic outlets, submission of articles for publication in academic or professional journals, production of edited books, and production of authored or co-authored books—with Latinos showing a mean of 3.6 publications and European Americans, a mean of 3.8.

Solicitation and Receipt of Support for Research, and Research Supporting Practices

In seeking out and receiving support for their research, the Latino respondents showed considerable activity. Over their careers, 84.6 percent of the respondents submitted 1 to 21 or more grant proposals; and 75.2 percent reported receipt of funding for 1 to 21 or more proposals. Also, over their careers, 55.3 percent of the respondents submitted 1 to 5 or more applications for fellowships; and 50.3 percent reported 1 to 5 or more acceptances for the fellowship applications. Additionally, over their careers, most of the respondents acquired their funding from three sources: 80.5 percent reported research

funding from their institution or academic department; 52.5 percent received funding from a federal agency; and 49.5 percent received funding from a private foundation. The respondents also reported funding from state and local government agencies, with 31.9 percent receiving funding; and from private industry, with 12.6 percent of the respondents receiving funding.

The majority (88.1 percent) of the respondents reported that they circulated their work with colleagues prior to submitting it for publication. Of the faculty who circulated their work prior to submission for publication, 74.7 percent indicated that they usually shared their work with subject matter specialists, regardless of the ethnicity of the specialist.

Ethnic Research

Most of the Latino respondents are interested in and actually research ethnic issues. For the most part, the respondents have increased the extent to which their research focuses on ethnic issues, although they don't feel pressured to conduct ethnic research. When asked to compare their interest in research and teaching ethnic-related issues to their interest in research and teaching other types of issues, 64.6 percent of the Latinos reported that they were either more interested in ethnic-related issues or equally interested in ethnic-related and other types of issues. Sixty-one percent of the respondents reported that they actually conducted research on ethnic issues, and 73.5 percent indicated that they did not feel pressured to research and teach ethnic issues. Of those respondents who reported pressure to research and teach on ethnic issues, 13.4 percent reported pressure from students, and 13.4 percent reported pressure from ethnic colleagues. Finally, 84.3 percent of the respondents indicated that their focus on ethnic issues in their research had increased since they began their current appointment.

For those respondents who received funding for ethnic-related research, support came primarily from three sources: 39.5 percent received funding from their institutions or

academic departments; 27.7 percent received funding from private foundations; and 24.3 percent received funding from federal agencies.

Teaching

The Latino respondents devote a considerable portion of their time each week to teaching activities. Forty percent of the respondents reported that they devote 25 to 49 percent of their time each week to teaching, while another 30 percent reported that they allotted 50 to 74 percent of their time to teaching. Additionally, the largest group (65 percent) devoted 3 to 6 hours per week to office hours, and 83.9 percent scheduled additional office hours within the current term in order to advise or mentor students.

In the advising or mentoring relationships that the faculty have with students, 15.1 percent of the respondents reported that they initiated those relationships most of the time, and 62.1 percent reported that students initiated those relationships most of the time. Finally, 84 percent of the respondents reported that they served on a dissertation or thesis committee 1 to 5 or more times during the prior two years.

The respondents' involvement in teaching gains some perspective through a review of findings from a comparative study of matched pairs of Latino and European American faculty at research universities in the southwestern United States (Guerrero, 1995). Using matched pair t-tests to test the null hypothesis that the mean scores of the Latino and the European American faculty were not significantly different in the areas of teaching, research, and service, Guerrero's study (1995) found that the two faculty groups evidenced similar availability to students through the number of set weekly office hours, with mean scores for Latinos being 4.0 hours and for European Americans, 4.3 hours. Also the two groups demonstrated similarity in their mentoring relationships and primary interests, with Latinos showing a mean score of 7.26 for mentoring and interests, and European Americans, a mean of 7.25.

Service

Most of the respondents allotted some portion of their professional time to service; 64 percent indicated that each week they devoted from 1 to 24 percent of their time to service. During the prior two years, the respondents were more active within their own departments or campus than within the larger field of their discipline; 39.8 percent had organized 1 to 4 professional meetings, and 35 percent had served 1 to 4 times on an editorial board of a journal. During the same period of time, 61.3 percent had participated in 1 to 5 or more campus committees, 60.9 percent had participated 1 to 4 times in their departments' curriculum revision, and 50.3 had participated in 1 to 4 studies to help solve a problem within their department or institution. In spite of their frequent involvement in departmental and campus committees, most of the respondents did not have leadership positions in those groups; 51 percent reported that they had not chaired a campus or departmental committee within the prior two years. Twenty percent of the respondents reported administrative appointments.

In community organizations, more of the respondents were members of groups concerned with minority issues than groups concerned with other issues; 45 percent reported membership in groups concerned with minority issues, and 32 percent reported membership in groups concerned with other issues. The opposite is true, however, with professional organizations, where a large group (86 percent) reported membership in groups that are not predominantly ethnic minority in membership.

Findings from a comparative study (Guerrero, 1995) of matched pairs of Latino and European American faculty at research universities in the southwestern United States help to bring some perspective to this study's survey results. Using matched pair t-tests to test the null hypothesis that the mean scores of the Latino and the European American faculty were not significantly different in the areas of teaching, research, and service, Guerrero's study (1995) found that the two faculty groups demonstrated similarity in their rate of service within the prior two years. A single category within the domain of service was

measured through six variables: organization of professional meetings, service on an editorial board of a journal, participation in campus-wide committees dealing with major issues, chairing a campus or departmental committee, participation in departmental curriculum revision, and participation in a study to solve a problem within the department or institution. Each of the variables measured the frequency of the faculty member's participation within the prior two years of his/her career. The two groups demonstrated similarity in their rate of service, with Latinos showing a mean of 5.40 for service activities, and European Americans, a mean of 6.04.

Discussion and Conclusions

Latino Faculty in Research Institutions

Based on the findings of this study, the Latino faculty at four research institutions in the southwestern United States were a diverse, well-educated, and productive group. Most, or 88.5 percent, of them self-identified as Chicano, Latino, or Hispanic, with the remainder identifying as Cuban, Puerto Rican, South American, and Native American. The majority, or 73.3 percent were male, and most were between 29 and 48 years of age. A little more than half of the Latinos were tenured, and altogether 93.3 percent reported tenured or tenure-track positions. The largest group, or 40.8 percent of Latinos were assistant professors, with the remaining faculty evenly distributed between full and associate professorships.

Most Latino faculty held relatively recent appointments of five years or less at their current institutions, and most have held their present professional rank for 4 or fewer years. The majority of Latinos at research institutions had a Ph.D. or Ed.D, which was granted by a prestigious doctoral school. Latinos were distributed throughout the academic areas, but the majority of them were in liberal arts, education, and the professional graduate schools.

Slightly more than a third of the Latino faculty were of foreign birth. The majority of those Latinos were 21 years of age or older and had completed 13 or more years of

school at the time that they established permanent residence in the United States. The large group of foreign-born Latino faculty was a surprising finding in this study. More research should be conducted on this group of faculty. Specifically, an investigation of differences and similarities in foreign-born and native-born Latino faculty should be considered for future research.

The Professional Roles of Latino Faculty

Most Latino faculty indicated that their primary professional interest lies in both teaching and research, but their interest leans toward research. This dichotomy of expressed interests by the faculty was confirmed by their actual behaviors. Findings from this study indicated that 35 percent of Latino faculty in research universities devote 25 to 49 percent of their time each week to research; and 41.6 percent devote similar percentages of time to teaching each week. The majority or 64.1 percent of Latino faculty devote 1 to 24 percent of their weekly time to service. A small group (20.8 percent) of Latino faculty hold administrative positions.

Within the service domain, Latino faculty are more likely to be active within their own departments or campus than within the larger field of their discipline. Also, Latino faculty are unlikely to hold leadership positions within their departments. For example, findings from this study show that the majority or 51.6 percent of Latino faculty have not organized a professional meeting; however, 46.2 percent have participated in a campus committee from 1 to 4 times during the prior two years. The majority or 61 percent of Latino faculty have participated in their department's curriculum revision, and 50.4 percent have taken part in a study to solve a problem within their department, college, or university on 1 to 4 occasions during the prior two years. Most (57.2 percent) Latino faculty, however, have not served on an editorial board of a journal, and 51.6 percent have not chaired a campus or departmental committee.

In community organizations, Latino faculty are more likely to be members of groups that are concerned with minority issues than groups that are concerned with other issues.

The opposite is true, however, with professional organizations, where Latinos are more likely to be members of groups that are not predominantly ethnic minority in membership. The implications of the preponderance of membership in non-minority professional organizations are unclear. Whether membership in such organizations is indicative of Latinos' practicality, their dedication to their discipline, the absence of Latino professional organizations, or some other circumstance, is speculative at this time. Certainly, an investigation of the Latino scholar's organizational membership that explores the motivations for membership, the level of involvement, and the rewards of membership in professional organizations would be worthwhile.

Research Productivity and Research Interests

The largest group or 50.4 percent of the Latino faculty reported that they had published 1 to 10 articles in refereed journals over their entire career. Also, 45.3 percent of the faculty reported that they had published or edited alone or in collaboration 1 to 4 books and monographs over their career. Latinos have been active in submitting their work for publication. This study found that within the prior two years, 52.4 percent of the Latinos reported that they had submitted articles for publications from 1 to 4 times.

Conventional knowledge holds that Latino faculty primarily research and publish on ethnic issues. The Latino scholar's interest in research and publication of ethnic issues has been documented in a few studies (Garza, 1992; Johnsrud and Sadao, 1993; Padilla and Chavez, 1995; Wolf and Ingle, 1993) and assumed in most other literature (Washington and Harvey, 1989; Reyes and Halcon, 1988; Escobedo, 1980; Arce, 1976). Findings from this study are consistent with the previous literature on Latino scholarship, as most of the respondents expressed interest in researching ethnic issues, and most of them actually conducted research on those issues. A clear majority or 64.6 percent of the Latinos indicated that in their research, they were either more interested in ethnic-related issues or equally interested in ethnic-related and other types of issues. Furthermore, a similar percentage or 61.8 percent indicated that they actually did conduct research on ethnic

issues. Interestingly, Latino faculty who conduct research on ethnic issues do so out of choice; 73.5 percent of the respondents indicated that they did not feel pressured to research ethnic issues.

The large group of Latino faculty in this study who conduct research on ethnic issues is consistent with previous literature on minority academics. In fact, the Latino's strong preference for researching and teaching ethnic issues supports the prediction from Patterson's (1975) model that minority faculty in research institutions would align themselves with ethnic groups and ethnic issues and would also practice professional behaviors associated with reward and survival. Patterson's model suggests that it is through these behaviors that minority faculty in research institutions can reconcile competing allegiances between ethnic/class interests, and still maximize their professional circumstances. Findings from this study suggest that Patterson's principles of class interests, reconciliation, and optimization may provide one part of an explanation for the Latino's professional behavior in research institutions.

Additionally, the large percentage of Latino faculty in this study who conduct research on ethnic issues is consistent with, though less resounding than, Garza's (1992) findings that 85 percent of his Latino respondents were currently involved in research on Latinos. Likewise, this study's report that 61.8 percent of Latino faculty conduct research on ethnic issues was preceded by Wolf and Ingle's (1993) findings that 57 percent of Latina academics conduct ethnic-related research most or all of the time.

Because the majority of Latino faculty conduct research on ethnic issues, the assumption could be adopted that most of the publications produced by those faculty are concerned with ethnic issues. This study did not measure the actual number of publications by Latino faculty that dealt with ethnic issues, so no conclusive answer is possible. This is an area, however, that should be explored in future research. Also, the related questions of whether the Latinos' propensity for conducting ethnic research diminishes or enhances their chances of getting their research published should be examined. The literature on Latino

faculty assumes that ethnic research is a liability for the Latino academic, but there is no conclusive data to support that assumption.

As previously noted, this study included faculty from a broad range of departments and academic programs at four research institutions in order to access the maximum number of potential Latino candidates for the sample frame. The conclusions of this study are therefore generalizable only to faculty in similar circumstances. More restrictive studies that include faculty from only a few departments or academic programs or that include faculty from institutions other than research universities may reach different conclusions.

Recommendations for Future Research

Findings from this study pose five questions regarding the Latino's interest in research on ethnic issues. What portion of the work published by Latinos is concerned with ethnic issues? Does the Latino's propensity for conducting ethnic research diminish or enhance the chances of getting work published? Has the status of research on ethnic issues improved in research institutions? If the status has improved, what influenced the change, and will its effect be temporary or lasting? What factors inhibit Latinos from receiving grants from grant-making agencies?

Additionally, findings from this study of work roles and research productivity raise deeper questions about how well Latino faculty are performing in research production. Future research should investigate four key questions. In what publications is Latino research published? Who is using the research conducted by Latinos? Is the research conducted by Latinos advancing the general disciplines, or is it self-contained? Finally, how do the previously mentioned variables influence the criteria that members of the discipline use to evaluate and promote faculty?

References

Acevedo, B. & Escobedo, T. (1981) Minorities and women in research: Strategies to increase opportunities. In T.H. Escobedo (Ed), Education and Chicanos: Issues and research (pp.67-88). Los Angeles: Spanish Speaking Mental Health Research Center.

Aguirre, A., Jr. (1987). An interpretive analysis of Chicano faculty in academe. The Social Science Journal, 24(1), 71-81.

Alvarez, R. (1985). The psycho-historical and socioeconomic development of the Chicano community in the United States. In R.O. de la Garza, et al. (Eds)., The Mexican American experience: An interdisciplinary anthology. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Anderson, W., et al. (1979, Winter). Black survival in white academe. Journal of Negro Education, 48, 92-102.

Arce, C.H. (1976). Chicanos on higher education. Integrated Education, 14(3). 14-18.

Blackburn, R.T.; Behymer, C.E.; & Hall, D.E. (1978, April). Research note: Correlates of faculty publications. Sociology of Education, 51, 132-141.

Brown, S.V. (1988). Increasing minority faculty: An elusive goal. A research report of the minority graduate education project. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service and Graduate Record Examination Board. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. EDD 021 881).

Chaney, F.B. (1966). A cross-cultural study of industrial research performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 50, 206-210.

Cole, J.R., & Zuckerman, H. (1984). The productivity puzzle: Persistence and change in patterns of publication among men and women scientists. In M.W. Steinkamp & M. Maehr (Eds.), Advances in motivation and achievement, Vol. 2 (pp. 217-257). Greenwich, CT.: JAI Press.

Creswell, J.W. (1985). Faculty research performance: Lessons from the sciences and social sciences. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

De Vires, D.L. (1975). The relationship of role expectations to faculty behavior. Research in Higher Education, 3, 111-129

Dillman, D.A. (1978). Mail and telephone sruveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Elmore, C. & Blackburn, R.T. (1983, Jan./Feb.). Black and White faculty in white research universities. Journal of Higher Education, 54, 1-5.

Escobedo, T.H. (1980, October). Are Hispanic women in higher education the nonexistent minority? Educational Researcher, 9(9), 7-12.

Fox, M.F. (1985). Publication, performance, and reward in science and scholarship. In J.C. Stuart (Ed.) Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. 1. (pp. 255-282). New York: Agathon Press.

Friedlander, F. & Marguiles, N. (1969). Multiple impacts of organizational climate and individual value systems upon job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 22, 171-183.

Fulton, O., & Trow, M. (1974, Winter). Research activity in American higher education. Sociology of Education, 47, 29-73.

Gandara, P. (1979). Early environmental correlates of higher academic achievement in Mexican Americans from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Gandara, P. (1986, November). Chicanos in higher education: The politics of self-interest. American Journal of Education, 256-272.

Garza, H. (1988, Winter). The barrioization of Hispanic faculty. Educational Record, 122-24.

Garza, H. (1992). Academic power, discourse, and legitimacy: Minority scholars in U.S. Universities. In M. Romero & C. Candelaria (Eds.) Proceedings of the National Association for Chicano Studies Conference (pp. 35-52). Berkeley: National Association for Chicano Studies.

Garza, H. (1992). Dilemmas of Chicano and Latino professors in U.S. Universities. AMAE Journal, 6-22.

Greenwald, A.G. (1982). Ego-task analysis: An integration of research on ego involvement and self-awareness. In A. Hastorf & A. Isen (Eds.). Cognitive social psychology (pp.109-147). New York: Elsevier.

Guerrero, J.K. (1995). Faculty professional roles and research productivity: A comparative study of Latino and European American faculty at research institutions in the southwestern United States. The University of Texas at Austin. Unpublished dissertation.

Johnsrud, L.K. & Sadao, K.C. (1993, November). Ethnic and racial minority faculty within a research university: Their common experiences. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Pittsburg, PA.

Ladd, E.C., Jr. & Lipset, S.M. (1977). Survey of the American professoriate. Storrs, CT.:University of Connecticut, Roper Center.

Lawrence, J.H. & Blackburn, R.T. (1991). Faculty at work: A manual for institutional self-study (Technical Report No.91-D-003). Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Long, J.S. (1978). Productivity and academic position in the scientific career. American Sociological Review, 63, 469-477.

McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (1984). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Menges, R.J., & Exum, W.H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 54(2), 123-144.

Moore, W., & Wagstaff, L. (1974). Black educators in white colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mukherjee, B.N. (1968). Achievement values and scientific productivity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 52, 145-147.

National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics. (1984). Make something happen: Hispanics and urban high school reform. Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: The Hispanic Policy Development Project.

Padilla, F.M. (1985). On the nature of Latino ethnicity. In Rodolfo de la Garza, et al. (Eds.), The Mexican American experience: An interdisciplinary anthology (pp. 332-345). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Padilla, R.V. & Chavez, R.C. (1995). The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities. NY: State University of New York.

Patterson, O. (1975). Context and choice in ethnic allegiance: A theoretical framework and Caribbean case study. In N. Glazer & D.P. Moynihan (Eds.), Ethnicity: Theory and experience (pp. 305-349). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.

Rafky, D.M. (1972, December). The Black scholar in the academic marketplace. Teachers College Record, 74, 225-260.

Reyes, M. & Halcon, J.J. (1988, August). Racism in academia: The old wolf revisited. Harvard Educational Review, 58(3) 299-314.

U.S. Department of Education. (1988). Characteristics of ethnic researchers and the education of white researchers. Edcuational Researcher, 9(9), 16-20.

Valverde, L. (1981). Achieving equity in higher education: Inclusion and retention of Hispanic academics. In T.H. Escobedo (Ed.), Education and Chicanos: Issues and research (pp. 49-66). Los Angeles: Spanish Speaking Mental Health Center.

Verdugo, R.R. (1992). Analysis of tenure among Hispanic higher education faculty. AMAE Journal, 23-30.

Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1989). Affirmative rhetoric, negative action: African American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly white institutions. Report No. 2. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, the George Washington University.

Wilson, R. (1987, February). Recruitment and retention of minority faculty and staff. AAHE-Bulletin, 11-14.

Wolf, L.E. & Ingel, Y.R. (1993, November). Latina faculty members: An almost invisible minority. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Pittsburg, PA.

Yuker, H.E. (1984). Faculty workload: Research, theory, and interpretation. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.